



[7590-01-P]

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC-2012-0078]

Biweekly Notice of Applications and Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Considerations

Background

Pursuant to Section 189a. (2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) is publishing this regular biweekly notice. The Act requires the Commission publish notice of any amendments issued, or proposed to be issued and grants the Commission the authority to issue and make immediately effective any amendment to an operating license or combined license, as applicable, upon a determination by the Commission that such amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, notwithstanding the pendency before the Commission of a request for a hearing from any person.

This biweekly notice includes all notices of amendments issued, or proposed to be issued from March 8, 2012, to March 21, 2012. The last biweekly notice was published on March 20, 2012 (77 FR 16271).

ADDRESSES: You may access information and comment submissions related to this document, which the NRC possesses and is publicly available, by searching on <http://www.regulations.gov> under Docket ID **2012-0078**.

You may submit comments by the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **2012-0078**. Address questions about NRC dockets to Carol Gallagher; telephone: 301-492-3668; e-mail: Carol.Gallagher@nrc.gov.

- **Mail comments to:** Cindy Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB), Office of Administration, Mail Stop: TWB-05-B01M, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

- **Fax comments to:** RADB at 301-492-3446.

For additional direction on accessing information and submitting comments, see “Accessing Information and Submitting Comments” in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this document.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Accessing Information and Submitting Comments

A. Accessing Information

Please refer to Docket ID **2012-0078** when contacting the NRC about the availability of information regarding this document. You may access information related to this document, which the NRC possesses and is publicly available, by the following methods:

- **Federal Rulemaking Web Site:** Go to <http://www.regulations.gov> and search for Docket ID **2012-0078**.

- **NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS):** You may access publicly available documents online in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To begin the search, select “[ADAMS Public](#)

[Documents](#)” and then select “[Begin Web-based ADAMS Search](#).” For problems with ADAMS, please contact the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov. Documents may be viewed in ADAMS by performing a search on the document date and docket number.

- **NRC's PDR:** You may examine and purchase copies of public documents at the NRC’s PDR, Room O1-F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852.

B. Submitting Comments

Please include Docket ID **2012-0078** in the subject line of your comment submission, in order to ensure that the NRC is able to make your comment submission available to the public in this docket.

The NRC cautions you not to include identifying or contact information in comment submissions that you do not want to be publicly disclosed. The NRC posts all comment submissions at <http://www.regulations.gov> as well as entering the comment submissions into ADAMS, and the NRC does not edit comment submissions to remove identifying or contact information.

If you are requesting or aggregating comments from other persons for submission to the NRC, then you should inform those persons not to include identifying or contact information in their comment submissions that they do not want to be publicly disclosed. Your request should state that the NRC will not edit comment submissions to remove such information before making the comment submissions available to the public or entering the comment submissions into ADAMS.

**Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating
Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards
Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the following amendment requests involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. The basis for this proposed determination for each amendment request is shown below.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendment until the expiration of 60 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Commission may issue the license amendment before expiration of the 60-day period provided that its final determination is that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration. In addition, the Commission may issue the amendment prior to the expiration of the 30-day comment period should circumstances change during the 30-day comment period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example in derating or shutdown of the facility. Should the Commission take action prior to the expiration of either the comment period or the notice period, it will publish in the *Federal Register* a notice of issuance. Should the Commission make a final No Significant

Hazards Consideration Determination, any hearing will take place after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Within 60 days after the date of publication of this notice, any person(s) whose interest may be affected by this action may file a request for a hearing and a petition to intervene with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating license or combined license. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested person(s) should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.309, which is available at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. The NRC regulations are accessible electronically from the NRC Library on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/cfr/>. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or a presiding officer designated by the Commission or by the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the Chief Administrative Judge of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of a hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.309, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following general requirements: 1) the name, address, and telephone number of the requestor or petitioner; 2) the nature of the requestor's/petitioner's right under the Act to be made a party to the proceeding; 3) the nature and extent of the requestor's/petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and 4) the possible effect of any decision or order which may be

entered in the proceeding on the requestor's/petitioner's interest. The petition must also identify the specific contentions which the requestor/petitioner seeks to have litigated at the proceeding.

Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the requestor/petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases for the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The requestor/petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the requestor/petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. The petition must include sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendment under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the requestor/petitioner to relief. A requestor/petitioner who fails to satisfy these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendment and make it immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendment. If the final determination is that the amendment request involves a

significant hazards consideration, then any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

All documents filed in NRC adjudicatory proceedings, including a request for hearing, a petition for leave to intervene, any motion or other document filed in the proceeding prior to the submission of a request for hearing or petition to intervene, and documents filed by interested governmental entities participating under 10 CFR 2.315(c), must be filed in accordance with the NRC E-Filing rule (72 FR 49139, August 28, 2007). The E-Filing process requires participants to submit and serve all adjudicatory documents over the internet, or in some cases to mail copies on electronic storage media. Participants may not submit paper copies of their filings unless they seek an exemption in accordance with the procedures described below.

To comply with the procedural requirements of E-Filing, at least 10 days prior to the filing deadline, the participant should contact the Office of the Secretary by e-mail at hearing.docket@nrc.gov, or by telephone at 301-415-1677, to request (1) a digital identification (ID) certificate, which allows the participant (or its counsel or representative) to digitally sign documents and access the E-Submittal server for any proceeding in which it is participating; and (2) advise the Secretary that the participant will be submitting a request or petition for hearing (even in instances in which the participant, or its counsel or representative, already holds an NRC-issued digital ID certificate). Based upon this information, the Secretary will establish an electronic docket for the hearing in this proceeding if the Secretary has not already established an electronic docket.

Information about applying for a digital ID certificate is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals/apply-certificates.html>. System requirements for accessing the E-Submittal server are detailed in the NRC's "Guidance for Electronic Submission," which is available on the agency's public Web site at

<http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. Participants may attempt to use other software not listed on the Web site, but should note that the NRC's E-Filing system does not support unlisted software, and the NRC Meta System Help Desk will not be able to offer assistance in using unlisted software.

If a participant is electronically submitting a document to the NRC in accordance with the E-Filing rule, the participant must file the document using the NRC's online, Web-based submission form. In order to serve documents through the Electronic Information Exchange System, users will be required to install a Web browser plug-in from the NRC's Web site. Further information on the Web-based submission form, including the installation of the Web browser plug-in, is available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>.

Once a participant has obtained a digital ID certificate and a docket has been created, the participant can then submit a request for hearing or petition for leave to intervene. Submissions should be in Portable Document Format (PDF) in accordance with the NRC guidance available on the NRC's public Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>. A filing is considered complete at the time the documents are submitted through the NRC's E-Filing system. To be timely, an electronic filing must be submitted to the E-Filing system no later than 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on the due date. Upon receipt of a transmission, the E-Filing system time-stamps the document and sends the submitter an e-mail notice confirming receipt of the document. The E-Filing system also distributes an e-mail notice that provides access to the document to the NRC's Office of the General Counsel and any others who have advised the Office of the Secretary that they wish to participate in the proceeding, so that the filer need not serve the documents on those participants separately. Therefore, applicants and other participants (or their counsel or representative) must apply for

and receive a digital ID certificate before a hearing request/petition to intervene is filed so that they can obtain access to the document via the E-Filing system.

A person filing electronically using the agency's adjudicatory E-Filing system may seek assistance by contacting the NRC Meta System Help Desk through the "Contact Us" link located on the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/site-help/e-submittals.html>, by e-mail at MSHD.Resource@nrc.gov, or by a toll-free call at 1-866 672-7640. The NRC Meta System Help Desk is available between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern Time, Monday through Friday, excluding government holidays.

Participants who believe that they have a good cause for not submitting documents electronically must file an exemption request, in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302(g), with their initial paper filing requesting authorization to continue to submit documents in paper format. Such filings must be submitted by: (1) first class mail addressed to the Office of the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff; or (2) courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service to the Office of the Secretary, Sixteenth Floor, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, 20852, Attention: Rulemaking and Adjudications Staff. Participants filing a document in this manner are responsible for serving the document on all other participants. Filing is considered complete by first-class mail as of the time of deposit in the mail, or by courier, express mail, or expedited delivery service upon depositing the document with the provider of the service. A presiding officer, having granted an exemption request from using E-Filing, may require a participant or party to use E-Filing if the presiding officer subsequently determines that the reason for granting the exemption from use of E-Filing no longer exists.

Documents submitted in adjudicatory proceedings will appear in the NRC's electronic hearing docket which is available to the public at <http://ehd1.nrc.gov/ehd/>, unless excluded

pursuant to an order of the Commission, or the presiding officer. Participants are requested not to include personal privacy information, such as social security numbers, home addresses, or home phone numbers in their filings, unless an NRC regulation or other law requires submission of such information. With respect to copyrighted works, except for limited excerpts that serve the purpose of the adjudicatory filings and would constitute a Fair Use application, participants are requested not to include copyrighted materials in their submission.

Petitions for leave to intervene must be filed no later than 60 days from the date of publication of this notice. Non-timely filings will not be entertained absent a determination by the presiding officer that the petition or request should be granted or the contentions should be admitted, based on a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.309(c)(1)(i)–(viii).

For further details with respect to this license amendment application, see the application for amendment which is available for public inspection at the NRC's PDR, located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through ADAMS in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737, or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Detroit Edison, Docket No. 50-341, Fermi 2, Monroe County, Michigan

Date of amendment request: December 20, 2011.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would modify Technical Specifications requirements related to primary containment isolation instrumentation. The

changes are in accordance with Nuclear Regulatory Commission approved Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF), Improved Standard Technical Specifications change TSTF-306, Revision 2.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the Proposed Change Involve a Significant Increase in the Probability or Consequences of an Accident Previously Evaluated?

Response: No

The addition of the note that the penetration flow path may be unisolated under administrative control provides consistency with what is already allowed elsewhere in TSs. The isolation function of the TIP [Traversing In-core Probe] valves is mitigative, and does not create any increased possibility of an accident. Also, the operation of the manual shear valves is unaffected by this activity. The ability to manually isolate the TIP system by either the normal isolation ball valves or the shear valves would be unaffected by the inoperable instrumentation. The Required Actions and their associated Completion Times are not initiating conditions for any accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, the proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed Change Create the Possibility of a New or Different Kind of Accident from any Accident Previously Evaluated?

Response: No

No new accident scenarios, failure mechanisms, or limiting single failures are introduced as result of the proposed changes. All systems, structures, and components previously required for the mitigation of a transient remain capable of fulfilling their intended design functions. The proposed changes have no adverse effects on any safety-related system or component and do not challenge the performance or integrity of any safety-related system. As a result no new failure modes are being introduced.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the Proposed Change Involve a Significant Reduction in a Margin of Safety?

Response: No

The proposed change will not affect the operation of plant equipment or the function of any equipment assumed in the accident analysis. The allowance to unisolate a penetration flow path will not have a significant effect on the margin of safety because the penetration flow path can be isolated manually, if needed. This change provides consistency with what is already allowed elsewhere in TSs. The option to isolate a TIP penetration will ensure the penetration will perform as designed in the accident analysis. The ability to manually isolate the TIP system is unaffected by the inoperable instrumentation. The proposed change does not impact any safety analysis assumptions or results.

Therefore, the proposed change does not result in a significant reduction in the margin of safety

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Bruce R. Masters, DTE Energy, General Council - Regulatory, 688 WCB, One Energy Plaza, Detroit, MI 48226-1279.

NRC Acting Branch Chief: Shawn A. Williams

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee (VY), LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.,

Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of amendment request: December 22, 2011.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Operating License (OL) Condition 3.S to allow Boiling Water Reactor Vessels and Internal Project

(BWRVIP)-139-A "BWR Vessel and Internals Project Steam Dryer Inspection and Flaw Evaluation Guidelines" to be the basis for future steam dryer monitoring and inspections.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The amendment does not significantly increase the probability of an accident since it does not involve a change to any plant equipment that initiates a plant accident. The change affects the standard by which future steam dryer monitoring and structural integrity inspections are performed. The proposed standard has been approved for use by the NRC. The steam dryer is not an initiator or mitigator of any previously evaluated accidents. Maintaining structural integrity of the steam dryer ensures that systems and components that are credited in station safety analysis function as designed.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment does not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment and does not change the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. The change affects the standard by which future steam dryer monitoring and structural integrity inspections are performed. The proposed standard has been approved for use by the NRC. No new or different types of equipment will be installed and the basic operation of installed equipment is unchanged. The methods governing plant operation and testing remain consistent with current safety analysis assumptions.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment affects the standard by which future steam dryer monitoring and structural integrity inspections are performed. The proposed standard has been approved for use by the NRC. The change does not affect design codes or design margins. The change provides for monitoring and inspection of the steam dryer to ensure the dryer maintains its integrity and does not affect safety related equipment. This ensures analyzed safety margins are maintained.

Therefore, operation of VY in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin to safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. William C. Dennis, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 400 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: George Wilson.

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee (VY), LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.,

Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of amendment request: February 1, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise Technical Specification (TS) 4.7.A.6.b to allow the drywell to suppression chamber leak rate test to be performed once per operating cycle. No changes to test acceptance criteria are proposed.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment does not significantly increase the probability or consequences of an accident since it does not involve a modification to any plant equipment or affect how plant systems or components are operated. No design functions or design parameters are affected by the proposed amendment. The proposed amendment involves the scheduling of a surveillance requirement so that the affected surveillance can be done anytime during the operating cycle. The proposed amendment does not impact the ability of the vacuum breakers to function in the event of a LOCA [loss-of-coolant accident] during the test. Performance of the surveillance on line versus during a refuel outage does not pose a significant increase in risk. No changes to the acceptance criteria for the surveillance are proposed.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed change involves the schedule for performing a TS surveillance requirement. The proposed change does not change the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. No new or different types of equipment will be installed and the test will be performed within the bounds of the TS requirements. The methods governing plant operation and testing remain consistent with current safety analysis assumptions. The proposed amendment involves the scheduling of a surveillance requirement so that the affected surveillance can be done anytime during the operating cycle. No changes to acceptance criteria for the surveillance are proposed.

Therefore, the proposed change does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment involves the scheduling of a surveillance requirement so that the affected surveillance can be done anytime during the operating cycle. No changes to the acceptance criteria for the surveillance are proposed. The proposed change ensures that the safety functions of the pressure suppression chamber-drywell vacuum breakers continue to be fulfilled by performing the

surveillance. The proposed amendment does not involve a physical modification of the plant and does not change the design or function of any component or system.

Therefore, the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. William C. Dennis, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 400 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: George Wilson.

Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee (VY), LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc.,

Docket No. 50-271, Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station, Vernon, Vermont

Date of amendment request: March 5, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise VY Renewed Facility Operating License Condition (RFOLC) 3.P to clarify that the programs and activities described in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) supplement submitted pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 54.21(d), as revised during the license renewal application process, may be changed without prior NRC approval provided the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59 have been previously satisfied. Additionally, RFOLC 3.Q is revised to clarify that the programs and activities, identified in Appendix A of Supplement 2 to NUREG-1907 and the UFSAR supplement, to be completed before the period of extended

operation are completed on schedule and the NRC is to be notified upon completion of implementation of these activities.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The amendment does not significantly increase the probability of an accident since it does not involve a change to any plant equipment that initiates a plant accident. The change clarifies RFOLC 3.P and 3.Q. The license conditions deal with administrative controls over information contained in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) supplement. The proposed changes are administrative and the license conditions are not an initiator or mitigator of any previously evaluated accidents.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated since it does not involve any physical alteration of plant equipment and does not change the method by which any safety-related system performs its function. The license conditions deal with administrative controls over information contained in the UFSAR supplement. No new or different types of equipment will be installed and the basic operation of installed equipment is unchanged.

Therefore, the proposed amendment does not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed amendment does not affect design codes or design margins. The change clarifies RFOLC 3.P and 3.Q, is administrative in nature and does not have the ability to affect analyzed safety margins.

Therefore, operation of VY in accordance with the proposed amendment will not involve a significant reduction in the margin to safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mr. William C. Dennis, Assistant General Counsel, Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc., 400 Hamilton Avenue, White Plains, NY 10601.

NRC Branch Chief: George Wilson.

PSEG Nuclear LLC, Docket No. 50-354, Hope Creek Generating Station, Salem County, New Jersey

Date of amendment request: March 1, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would make miscellaneous changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) and Facility Operating License (FOL) including: (1) correction of typographical errors; (2) deletion of historical requirements that have expired; (3) corrections of errors or omissions from previous license amendment requests; and (4) updating of component lists to reflect current plant design.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below with Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff edits in square brackets:

1. Do the proposed changes involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to TS and the FOL are administrative in nature that correct typographical errors, or delete historical requirements that have expired. These changes do not affect the intent of any TS requirements.

The proposed changes do not have any impact on structures, systems and components (SSCs) of the plant, and [have] no affect on plant operations. The proposed changes do not impact any accident initiators or analyzed events or assumed mitigation of accident or transient events. The proposed changes to the technical specifications do not result in the addition or removal of any equipment but update component lists to reflect equipment that was previously removed or abandoned.

Therefore, these proposed changes do not represent a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Do the proposed changes create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to TS and the FOL are administrative in nature that correct typographical errors, or delete historical requirements that have expired. These changes do not affect the intent of any TS requirements.

The proposed changes do not involve a modification to the physical configuration of the plant (i.e., no new equipment will be installed) or change in the methods governing normal plant operation. The proposed changes will not impose any new or different requirements or introduce a new accident initiator, accident precursor, or malfunction mechanism.

Additionally, there is no change in the types or increases in the amounts of any effluent that may be released off-site and there is no increase in individual or cumulative occupational exposure.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. Do the proposed changes involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed changes to TS and the FOL are editorial in nature that correct typographical errors, or delete historical requirements that have expired. These changes do not affect the intent of any TS requirements.

The proposed changes incorporate corrections to the TS and FOL and result in improved accuracy of these licensing documents. There is no change to any design basis, licensing basis or safety limit, and no change to any parameters; consequently no safety margins are affected.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, and with the changes noted above in square brackets, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Jeffrie J. Keenan, PSEG Nuclear LLC - N21, P.O. Box 236, Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038.

NRC Branch Chief: Meena K. Khanna.

**Previously Published Notices of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility
Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards
Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing**

The following notices were previously published as separate individual notices. The notice content was the same as above. They were published as individual notices either because time did not allow the Commission to wait for this biweekly notice or because the action involved exigent circumstances. They are repeated here because the biweekly notice lists all amendments issued or proposed to be issued involving no significant hazards consideration.

For details, see the individual notice in the *Federal Register* on the day and page cited.

This notice does not extend the notice period of the original notice.

PPL Susquehanna, LLC, Docket No. 50-388, Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania

Date of amendment request: March 8, 2012.

Description of amendment request: The amendment allows a one-time temporary extension of 24 hours to the Completion Time for Condition C in the Susquehanna Steam Electric Station (SSES) Unit 2 Technical Specification (TS) 3.8.7, “Distribution Systems-Operating,” to allow a Unit 1 4160 V subsystem to be de-energized and removed from service for 96 hours to perform modifications on the bus. It also allows a one-time temporary extension of 24 hours to the Completion Time for Condition A in SSES Unit 2 TS 3.7.1, “Plant Systems-RHRSW [residual heat removal service water system] and UHS [ultimate heat sink],” to allow the UHS spray array and spray array bypass valves associated with applicable division RHRSW, and in Condition B, the applicable division Unit 2 RHRSW subsystem, to be inoperable for 96 hours during the Unit 1 4160 V bus breaker control logic modifications.

Date of publication of individual notice in *Federal Register*: March 16, 2012 (77 FR 15814)

Expiration date of individual notice: Comment period, April 16, 2012; Hearing period, May 15, 2012.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Combined Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these

amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

A notice of consideration of issuance of amendment to facility operating license or combined license, as applicable, proposed no significant hazards consideration determination, and opportunity for a hearing in connection with these actions, was published in the *Federal Register* as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these amendments satisfy the criteria for categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for these amendments. If the Commission has prepared an environmental assessment under the special circumstances provision in 10 CFR 51.22(b) and has made a determination based on that assessment, it is so indicated.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the applications for amendment, (2) the amendment, and (3) the Commission's related letter, Safety Evaluation and/or Environmental Assessment as indicated. All of these items are available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Room O1-F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland 20852. Publicly available documents created or received at the NRC are accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) in the NRC Library at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the PDR's Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737 or by email to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

Duke Energy Carolinas, LLC, et al., Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414, Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, York County, South Carolina

Date of application for amendments: June 30, 2011, as supplemented by letters dated July 11, 2011, January 12, 2012, and February 1, 2012.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revised Technical Specification (TS) 3.4.13, "RCS [Reactor Coolant System] Operational LEAKAGE," TS 5.5.9, "Steam Generator (SG) Program," and TS 5.6.8, "Steam Generator (SG) Tube Inspection Report." Specifically, the amendments revised the TSs to accomplish the following objectives: permanently exclude portions of a steam generator (SG) tube below the top of the SG tubesheet from periodic SG tube inspections and plugging, permanently reduce the primary-to-secondary leakage limit, and permanently implement reporting requirement changes that had been previously established on a one-cycle basis.

Date of issuance: March 12, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented prior to entering the applicable Modes of the affected TS at the completion of the outage.

Amendment Nos.: Unit 1 - 267 and Unit 2 - 263.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52: Amendments revised the licenses and the technical specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: January 19, 2012 (77 FR 2766).

The supplemental letters dated July 11, 2011, January 12, 2012, and February 1, 2012, provided additional information that clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the staff's original proposed no significant hazards consideration (NSHC) determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments and final NSHC determination are contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 12, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket Nos. 50-352 and 50-353, Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2, Montgomery County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendments: June 2, 2011, as supplemented on November 10, 2011.

Brief description of amendments: The amendments revise the Technical Specifications for each unit by changing the method of calculating core reactivity for the purpose of performing the reactivity anomaly surveillance at Limerick Generating Station, Units 1 and 2. The change allows performance of the surveillance based on a comparison of predicted to actual (monitored) core reactivity. The reactivity anomaly verification was previously determined by a comparison of predicted versus actual control rod density.

Date of issuance: March 14, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance, and shall be implemented within 60 days.

Amendment Nos.: 207 and 168.

Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-39 and NPF-85. These amendments revised the license and the technical specifications.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: August 9, 2011 (76 FR 48911).

The supplement dated November 10, 2011, clarified the application, did not expand the scope of the application as originally noticed, and did not change the initial proposed no significant hazards consideration determination.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in Safety Evaluation dated March 14, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Attorney for licensee: J. Bradley Fewell, Esquire, Associate General Counsel, Exelon Generation Company, LLC, 4300 Winfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555.

NRC Branch Chief: Meena Khanna.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-254, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: June 7, 2011, as supplemented by letters dated. September 21, 2011, November 2, 2011, and January 9, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the value of the single recirculation loop operation (SLO) safety limit minimum critical power ratio (SLMCPR) in Technical Specifications Section 2.1.1, "Reactor Core SLs [Safety Limits]." Specifically, the revision replaces the current SLO SLMCPR requirement for QCNPS Unit 1 with a new SLMCPR requirement. The revision is necessary because of errors that were discovered in the Westinghouse McSLAP computer code that resulted in a non-conservative SLO SLMCPR.

Date of issuance: March 8, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 250.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-29: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications and License.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: August 16, 2011 (72 FR 50762).

The September 21, 2011, November 2, 2011, and January 9, 2012, supplements contained clarifying information and did not change the NRC staff's initial proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 12, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Exelon Generation Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-265, Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Unit 2, Rock Island County, Illinois

Date of application for amendment: November 22, 2011, as supplemented by letter dated January 9, 2012.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment revises the value of the single recirculation loop operation (SLO) and dual recirculation loop operation (DLO) safety limit minimum critical power ratio (SLMCPR) in Technical Specifications Section 2.1.1, "Reactor Core SLs [Safety Limits]." Specifically, the revision replaces the current SLO and DLO SLMCPR requirement for QCNPS Unit 2 with a new SLMCPR requirement. The revision is necessary because of errors that were discovered in the Westinghouse McSLAP computer code that resulted in non-conservative SLMCPR values.

Date of issuance: March 8, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented within 30 days.

Amendment No.: 245.

Renewed Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-30: The amendments revised the Technical Specifications and License.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: January 3, 2012 (77 FR 140).

The January 9, 2012, supplement, contained clarifying information and did not change the NRC staff's initial proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendments is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 8, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, et al., Docket Nos. 50-334 and 50-412, Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and 2), Beaver County, Pennsylvania

Date of application for amendment: May 27, 2011.

Brief description of amendment: The amendments revise Technical Specifications (TSs) associated with replacing sodium hydroxide with sodium tetraborate as a chemical additive for containment sump pH control following a loss-of-coolant accident at BVPS-1. Due to common TSs for BVPS-1 and 2, administrative changes were made to BVPS-2 license to reflect the BVPS-1 changes.

Date of issuance: March 14, 2012.

Effective date: As of the date of issuance and shall be implemented prior to achieving Mode 4 during startup from the BVPS-1 refueling outage in the spring of 2012.

Amendment Nos.: 289 and 176.

Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-66 and NPF-73: Amendments revise the Licenses and TSs.

Date of initial notice in *Federal Register*: January 10, 2012 (77 FR 1518).

The Commission's related evaluation of the amendment is contained in a Safety Evaluation dated March 14, 2012.

No significant hazards consideration comments received: No.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of March 2012.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Michele G. Evans, Director
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

[FR Doc. 2012-7676 Filed 04/02/2012 at 8:45 am;
Publication Date: 04/03/2012]